arXiv:1511.03346v1 [astro-ph.GA] 11 Nov 2015

The Orbits and Total Mass of the Magellanic Clouds

Gurtina Besla

Abstract This proceeding overviews our current understanding of the orbital history and mass of the Large and Small Magellanic Clouds. Specifically I will argue that the Clouds are on their first infall about our Milky Way and that their total masses are necessarily $\sim$10 times larger than traditionally estimated. This conclusion is based on the recently revised HST proper motions of the Clouds and arguments concerning the binary status of the LMC-SMC pair and their baryon fractions.

1 Introduction

Owing to their proximity to our Galaxy, the Magellanic Clouds (MCs) have been observed in wavebands spanning almost the entire electromagnetic spectrum, allowing us to study the interstellar medium (ISM) of two entire galaxies in unprecedented detail. Such observations have facilitated studies of how turbulence, stellar feedback and star formation are interrelated and how these internal processes affect galactic structure on small to large scales (e.g., Elmegreen, Kim & Staveley-Smith, 2001; Block et al., 2010).

However, the MCs are also subject to environmental processes that can dramatically alter their internal structure. For example, the MCs are surrounded by a massive complex of HI gas in the form of a 150 degree long stream trailing behind them (the Magellanic Stream), a gaseous bridge connecting them (the Magellanic Bridge) and an HI complex that leads them (the Leading Arm) (Nidever et al., 2010). This material once resided within the MCs and was likely stripped out by some combination of external tides and/or hydrodynamic processes.

Gurtina Besla
Steward Observatory, University of Arizona, 933 North Cherry Avenue, Tucson, AZ 85721, e-mail: gbesla@email.arizona.edu

Recently, Fox et al. (2014) revealed that these HI structures harbor a significant amount of ionized gas, increasing the total gas mass budget *outside* the MCs from 4.87×10^8 $M_\odot$ to $\sim 2 \times 10^9$ $M_\odot$. This extended gas complex thus represents a non-negligible fraction of the MW's circumgalactic medium (CGM).

Identifying the formation mechanism of these structures depends sensitively on the amount of time the MCs have spent in close proximity to the MW. Constraining the dynamics of the MCs is thus critical to our understanding of the morphologies, star formation histories and ISM properties of these important galactic laboratories.

Our understanding of the orbital history of the MCs has evolved considerably over the past 10 years. The canonical view, wherein the MCs have completed multiple orbits about the MW over a Hubble time (Murai & Fujimoto, 1980), has changed to one where they are recent interlopers, just completing their first passage about our Galaxy (Besla et al., 2007).

This dramatic change has been driven by two factors. Firstly, high precision proper motions measured using the Hubble Space Telescope (HST) have enabled accurate 3D velocities of both the Large and Small Magellanic Clouds (LMC and SMC). We now know the MCs are moving faster than previously believed, relative to not only the MW, but also to *each other* (Kallivayalil et al., 2006a; Kallivayalil, van der Marel & Alcock, 2006b; Kallivayalil et al., 2013).

Secondly, our understanding of the mass and structure of galactic dark matter halos has evolved. In the Λ Cold Dark Matter paradigm, low mass galaxies reside within massive dark matter halos, having much larger mass-to-light ratios than expected for galaxies like the MW. This means that the MCs are likely significantly more massive than traditionally modeled. Furthermore, the dark matter halos of massive galaxies are now understood to be poorly represented by isothermal sphere profiles at large distances. Instead, the dark matter density profile falls off more sharply, making it easier for satellites to travel to larger Galactocentric distances.

However, debate still ensues concerning the orbital history of the MCs. While the canonical picture, where the MCs have completed $\sim$6 orbits about the MW with an orbital period of $\sim$2 Gyr, has been largely dismissed, there are new proposed models where the MCs have completed one or two orbits about the MW within a Hubble time (Shattow & Loeb, 2009; Zhang et al., 2012; Diaz & Bekki, 2011, 2012). The goal of this review is to explain why the controversy arises and why various lines of evidence support a first infall scenario.

2 Determining the Orbit of the MCs

Reconstructing the past orbital history of the MCs depends on 3 important factors. 1) An accurate measurement of the current 3D velocity vector and distance of the MCs with respect to the MW. 2) The mass of the MW and its evolution over time. 3) The masses of the MCs, which ultimately determines the importance of dynamical friction as the MCs orbit about of the MW and each other.

The 3D Velocity of the MCs:

Recently, Kallivayalil et al. (2013, hereafter K13) used HST to measure the proper motions of stars in the LMC with respect to background quasars, obtaining 3 epochs of data spanning a baseline of $\sim$7 years and proper motion random errors of only 1-2% per field. This astonishing accuracy is sufficient to explore the internal stellar dynamics of the LMC, allowing for the first constraints on the large-scale rotation of *any* galaxy based on full 3D velocity measurements (van der Marel & Kallivayalil, 2014). This analysis has resulted in the most accurate measurement of the 3D Galactocentric velocity of the LMC and SMC to date. The LMC is currently moving at 321 $\pm$ 23 km/s with respect to the MW. The SMC is moving at 217 $\pm$ 26 km/s with respect to the MW and 128 $\pm$ 32 km/s with respect to the LMC; the SMC cannot be on a circular orbit about the LMC. Errors on the velocity measurement are now limited by the errors on the distance measurement to the Clouds rather than the proper motions.

The Mass of the MW:

The mass of the MW is uncertain within a factor of $\sim$2. Values for the virial mass range from M_{vir} =(0.75-2.25) $\times 10^{12}$ $M_\odot$. Here, M_{vir} is defined as the mass enclosed within the radius where the dark matter density is Δ_{vir} =360 times the average matter density, $\Omega_m \rho_{crit}$.

HST proper motions over a six year baseline revealed that the Leo I satelite is moving with a Galactocentric velocity of 196.0 $\pm$ 19.4 km/s (Sohn et al., 2013). At 260 kpc away, this is faster than the local escape speed of $\sim$180 km/s for a M_{vir}=10^{12} $M_\odot$ MW model. Since unbound satellite orbits are statistically improbable within ΛCDM cosmology (Boylan-Kolchin et al., 2013), we do not explore MW models lower than 10^{12} $M_\odot$.

Few upper limits on M_{vir} exist apart from the timing argument, which limits the combined total mass of the MW and M31. Using the HST proper motions of M31 and other mass arguments in the literature, van der Marel et al. (2012) estimate the Local Group mass to be 3.17 $\pm$ 0.57 $\times 10^{12}$ $M_\odot$. It is thus unlikely that the MW individually contributes much more than 2×10^{12} $M_\odot$.

In the orbital analysis that follows, we explore 3 different mass models: 10^{12}, 1.5×10^{12} and 2×10^{12} $M_\odot$. Using WMAP7 cosmology, the corresponding virial radii are R_{vir} = 250, 300 and 330 kpc. The MW is modeled as a static, axisymmetric, three-component model consisting of dark matter halo, exponential disk, and spheroidal bulge. Model parameters are listed in Table 2 of K13.

Note that the MW mass is expected to have grown by roughly a factor of 2 over the past 6 Gyr (Fakhouri, Ma & Boylan-Kolchin, 2010). K13 found that this mass evolution causes the orbital period of the LMC to increase substantially relative to static models. The orbital periods discussed in the following sections are thus underestimated.

The Mass of the LMC:

K13 found that the LMC's mass is the dominant uncertainty in its orbital history, since dynamical friction, which is proportional to the satellite mass squared, changes the LMC's orbit on timescales shorter than, e.g., the MW's mass evolution. The mass of the LMC also controls the orbit of the SMC, ultimately determining how long the two galaxies have interacted with each other as a binary pair (see §4).

The LMC has a well defined rotation curve that peaks at Vc = 91.7 $\pm$ 18.8 km/s and remains flat out to at least 8.7 kpc (van der Marel & Kallivayalil, 2014), consistent with the baryonic Tully-Fisher relation. This implies a minimum enclosed total mass of M(8.7 kpc) = 1.7 $\pm 10^{10}$ $M_\odot$; the LMC is dark matter dominated.

There is strong evidence that the stellar disk of the LMC extends to 15 kpc (Saha et al., 2010). If the rotation curve stays flat to at least this distance then the total mass enclosed is M(15 kpc) = $GVc^2/r \sim 3 \times 10^{10}$ $M_\odot$. This minimum value is consistent with LMC masses adopted by earlier models (e.g., Gardiner & Noguchi, 1996).

The total dynamical mass of the LMC can also be estimated using its baryon fraction. Currently, the LMC has a stellar mass of 2.7×10^9 $M_\odot$ and a gas mass of 5.0×10^8 $M_\odot$. The baryonic mass of the LMC is thus $M_{bar} = 3.2 \times 10^9$ $M_\odot$. Using the minimum total mass of $M_{tot} = 3 \times 10^{10}$ $M_\odot$, the baryon fraction of the LMC becomes M_{bar}/M_{tot} = 11%. This is much higher than the baryon fraction of disks in galaxies like the MW, which is on the order of 3-5%. In the shallower halo potentials of dwarf galaxies, stellar winds should be more efficient, making baryon fractions even lower, not higher.

This analysis is further complicated if material has been removed from the LMC. As mentioned earlier, Fox et al. (2014) have recently estimated the total gas mass (HI and ionized gas) outside the MCs at $2 \times 10^9 (d/55\text{kpc})^2$ $M_\odot$. If half of this material came from the LMC, as suggested by Nidever, Majewski & Burton (2008), its initial baryon fraction would be 14%, approaching the cosmic value. Note that the bulk of the Magellanic Stream likely resides at distances of order 100 kpc, rather than 55 kpc, in which case the baryon fraction would increase to $\sim$20%.

To get a baryon fraction matching observational expectations of f_{bar} $\sim$3-5%, the total mass of the LMC (at least at infall) needs to have been $20 - 6 \times 10^{10}$ $M_\odot$. This higher total mass is consistent with cosmological expectations from halo occupation models that relate a galaxy's observed stellar mass to its halo mass. Using relations from Moster, Naab & White (2013), the mean halo mass for a galaxy with a stellar mass of 2.7×10^9 $M_\odot$ is 1.7×10^{11} $M_\odot$, implying a baryon fraction of $f_{bar} \sim$ 2-4% (see Table 1). Because there is large scatter in halo occupation models, we consider a maximal halo mass for the LMC of 2.5×10^{11} $M_\odot$ in the analysis that follows.

The Mass of the SMC

The current dynamical mass of the SMC within 3 kpc is constrained between 2.7-5.1 $\times 10^9$ $M_\odot$, using the velocity dispersion of old stars (Harris & Zaritsky, 2006). This is larger than the current gas mass of the SMC is 4.2×10^8 $M_\odot$ and stellar mass of 3.1×10^8 $M_\odot$; the SMC is dark matter dominated. In most orbital models, the total mass of the SMC is estimated at $M_{DM} = 1.4 - 3 \times 10^9$ $M_\odot$ (Besla et al.,

2007; Kallivayalil et al., 2013; Diaz & Bekki, 2011; Gardiner & Noguchi, 1996). This yields $f_{\rm bar}$ ∼50%-20%, well above cosmological expectations.

This issue gets a lot worse when we account for the substantial amount of gas the SMC must have lost to form the Magellanic Stream, Bridge and Leading Arm. If we estimate again that half the total gas mass outside the MCs comes from the SMC, then the initial baryon mass of the SMC must have been $M_{\rm bar} = 1.73 \times 10^9$ $M_\odot$. Taking the traditional dark matter mass of 3×10^9 $M_\odot$ yields $f_{\rm bar} \sim 60\%$. It would take a total mass order $M_{\rm SMC} = 3 \times 10^{10}$ $M_\odot$ to obtain a baryon fraction of 5%. This value is consistent with the choice of $M_{\rm SMC} = 2 \times 10^{10}$ $M_\odot$ in B12 and B10 (see Table 1). Using cosmological halo occupation models the SMC dark matter mass is expected to be even higher. The mean expectation from relations in (Moster, Naab & White, 2013) is $M_{\rm SMC} = 4.2 \times 10^{10}$ $M_\odot$.

Table 1 The Total Mass of the Clouds

Baryonic Mass (10^9 $M_\odot$)	Dark Matter Mass (10^{10} $M_\odot$)	Baryon Fraction[a]	Motivation for Dark Matter Mass
LMC			
3.2	3	0.11	Traditional Models
	6	0.05	Minimum mass to get $f_{\rm bar} < \%5$
	17	0.02	B12, Mean ΛCDM[c]
	25	0.01	Maximal Model
4.2-6.5[b]	3	0.14-0.22	
	6	0.07 - 0.11	
	17	0.03-0.04	
	25	0.02 - 0.03	
SMC			
7.3	0.3	0.24	Traditional Models
	0.5	0.15	Max Dynamical Mass <3 kpc
	2	0.04	B12
	4.2	0.02	Mean ΛCDM[c]
17.3-40.3[b]	0.3	0.58-1.34	
	0.5	0.35-0.81	
	3	0.06-0.13	
	4.2	0.04-0.1	

[a] Gas mass/ (Stellar Mass + Gas Mass) [b] Including half the mass in the Magellanic Stream (total 2×10^9 M⊙) (Fox et al., 2014) at a distance of 55 kpc, or where half the stream is at 100 kpc (total 6.6×10^9 $M_\odot$). [c] Mean value from relations in Moster, Naab & White (2013) for LMC/SMC stellar masses.

3 Plausible Orbital Histories for the LMC

Following the methodology outlined in K13 and considerations for the mass of the MW and the mass and velocity of the LMC described in 2, the orbit of the LMC

can be integrated backwards in time. For various combinations of MW and LMC mass, Monte-Carlo drawings from the LMC's 4σ velocity error distribution are used to explore plausible orbital histories. Figure 1 shows the resulting mean orbital solutions for each MW/LMC mass combination. The LMC is considered to be on its first infall if it has not experienced more than one pericentric approach within the past 10 Gyr. In all cases the LMC has made at least one pericentric passage, since it is just at pericenter now.

The illustrated dependence on LMC mass explains the discrepancy in the literature concerning different orbital solutions. Most studies have adopted low mass LMC models, which allows for orbital solutions with lower eccentricity. For example, (Zhang et al., 2012) explore a variety of MW models to constrain the orbital history of the LMC, but they consider only one LMC mass model of 2×10^{10} $M_{\odot}$. Numerical models of the Magellanic System by (Diaz & Bekki, 2012, 2011) consider a total mass of only 10^{10} $M_{\odot}$, which is discrepant with the dynamical mass determined from the LMC's rotation curve. Other recent orbital studies adopt LMC masses of 3×10^{10} $M_{\odot}$ (e.g., Růžička, Theis & Palouš, 2010; Shattow & Loeb, 2009). These low masses are at odds with mass estimates from arguments about the baryon fraction of the LMC, which require a minimum dark matter mass of at least 6×10^{10} $M_{\odot}$ (§2).

The numerical models presented in (Besla et al., 2010, 2012, hereafter B10 and B12) were designed to account for cosmological expectations, and thus adopt an LMC mass of 1.8×10^{12} $M_{\odot}$.

Note that while lower halo masses do allow for solutions where the LMC has completed one orbit about the MW, the mean orbital period is 5 Gyr. This timescale is much longer than the age of the Magellanic Stream. Furthermore, in this study, the MW mass is assumed to be static in time. If the mass evolution of the MW were included, the orbital period would be even longer.

4 The LMC-SMC Binary

At a distance of $\sim$50 kpc from the Galactic center, the LMC and SMC are our closest example of an interacting pair of dwarf galaxies. Evidence of their ongoing interaction is clearly illustrated by the existence of the Magellanic Bridge that connects the two galaxies. This structure likely formed during their last close approach $\sim 100 - 300$ Myr ago (B12, Gardiner & Noguchi, 1996).

The tidal field of the MW makes it statistically improbable that the LMC could have randomly captured the SMC some 300 Myr ago while in orbit about the MW. It is more likely that the two galaxies were accreted as a binary; but the longevity of their binary status is unclear.

All models for the Magellanic Stream and Bridge invoke tidal interactions between the MCs to some degree. The MCs must therefore have interacted for at least the lifetime of the Stream. Based on the current high rate of ionization of the Stream (Weiner & Williams, 1996) and large extended ionized component



Fig. 1 Typical orbital histories for the LMC are indicated as a function of LMC and MW mass. Orbits are determined by searching the 4σ proper motion error space in Monte Carlo fashion and computing the mean number of pericentric passages completed within 10 Gyr. High mass LMC models experience greater dynamical friction and are consequently on more eccentric orbits, yielding first infall solutions (dark blue regions). Lower mass models allow for orbits where the LMC has made one pericentric passage (light purple regions); such solutions typically have orbital periods of order 5 Gyr. High MW mass and low LMC mass combinations are required for the LMC to have completed more than one orbit. The mass of the LMC needs to be larger than 3×10^{10} $M_\odot$ in order to account for LMC stars located at distances of $\sim$15 kpc from the LMC center and greater than 6×10^{10} $M_\odot$ for the baryon fraction of the LMC to approach $\sim$5%. Most studies have not considered such high mass models, apart from B12.

(Fox et al., 2014), it is unlikely that the Stream could have survived as a neutral HI structure for more than 1-2 Gyr (Bland-Hawthorn et al., 2007).

The star formation histories (SFHs) of the MCs also suggest a common evolutionary history. Weisz et al. (2013) illustrate that $\sim$4 Gyr ago, the SFHs of both the LMC and SMC appear to increase in concert. It is thus reasonable to assume the MCs have maintained a binary status for at least the past 4 Gyr.

Plausible Orbital Histories for the LMC-SMC Binary

The orbital analysis presented in Figure 1 is revisited, exploring the same LMC/MW mass range, but this time also searching the 4σ proper motion error space

of the SMC in addition to that of the LMC. The goal is to identify the combinations of LMC and MW mass that allow for the relative velocity of the MCs to be lower than the local escape speed of the LMC for some time in the past (not necessarily including today). Figure 2 illustrates the resulting mean longevity of the LMC-SMC binary as a function of LMC and MW mass.

The action of MW tides are detrimental to the longevity of the Magellanic binary. As the mass of the MW increases, its tidal field is stronger and thus long-lived binary configurations are rare. In particular, no long-lived solutions are found if the mass of the MW is greater than 2×10^{12} $M_{\odot}$. This places an interesting upper bound on the virial mass of the MW. If the MW is $> 2 \times 10^{12}$ $M_{\odot}$, the MCs could not have interacted for an appreciable amount of time in the past and their current proximity would be a random happenstance. Few upper bounds exist on the mass of the MW, making this a novel constraint.

The SMC has historically been modeled in a circular orbit about the LMC, with a relative velocity of order 60 km/s (Gardiner & Noguchi, 1996). However, the new HST measurements reveal that the relative velocity between the Clouds is significantly larger. At a relative velocity of 128 $\pm$ 32 km/s (K13), the SMC is moving well above the escape speed of the LMC if its total mass is 3×10^{10} $M_{\odot}$ (V_{esc} $\sim$110 km/s). This relative velocity measurement is a robust result that has been confirmed by other teams (Vieira et al., 2010; Piatek, Pryor & Olszewski, 2008) and has not changed substantially from the earlier HST results (Kallivayalil, van der Marel & Alcock, 2006b). This high speed makes it very difficult to maintain a long-lived binary, unless the LMC is substantially more massive than traditionally modeled.

The preferred configuration for a long-lived LMC-SMC binary is a low/intermediate mass MW + a high mass LMC. This is exactly the opposite requirement for orbital solutions where the LMC makes at least one orbit about the MW. In fact, the colors in Figure 2 correspond to the same as those in Figure 1; all binary solutions that last longer than 4 Gyr are first infall solutions.

The high relative velocity between the Clouds implies that the SMC is on an eccentric orbit about the LMC. Such binary configurations are easily disrupted by MW tides, meaning that even one previous pericentric passage is sufficient to have destroyed the binary. This result is consistent with the fact that only 3.5% of MW type galaxies host both an LMC and SMC stellar mass analog (Liu et al., 2011). Similarly, statistics from cosmological simulations find only 2.5% MW type dark matter halos host both LMC and SMC mass analogs (Boylan-Kolchin, Besla & Hernquist, 2011). Our MW galaxy is thus an oddity in that it hosts two massive satellites in close proximity to each other. However, this rare configuration can be understood if the MCs have only recently passed pericentric approach for the first time; only now are MW tides operating to disrupt this configuration.

This study implies that all existing models in the literature that invoke the new HST proper motions in combination with low mass LMCs *do not allow for long-lived LMC-SMC binary solutions*. In particular, because of the high speeds, no binary LMC-SMC solutions can exist in a MOND framework (Zhao et al., 2013).



Fig. 2 Similar to Figure 1, except now the SMC is also included in the orbital analysis; its 4σ proper motion error space is also searched in Monte Carlo fashion. Colored regions represent the same LMC orbital solutions as in Figure1, but here the longevity of the LMC-SMC binary is indicated. The SMC is assumed to be bound to the LMC if the relative velocity between the Clouds is less than the local escape speed of the LMC at any point in the past. Binary solutions are only viable in low/intermediate mass MW models + high LMC models; these are necessarily first infall orbits. Dynamical friction between the Clouds is not included in this analysis, but is expected to decrease the longevity of the binary orbit.

5 Further Support for a First Infall of a Binary LMC/SMC

The simplest argument in favor of a recent infall is the unusually high gas fractions of both the LMC and SMC, given their proximity to the MW. van den Bergh (2006) conducted a morphological comparison of the satellites of the MW and M31, finding that the L/SMC are the only two gas-rich dwarf Irregulars at close Galactocentric distance to their host. There are numerous environmental factors that work to quench star formation and morphologically change galaxies after they become satellite galaxies of massive hosts (see chapter by Carraro). It is thus remarkable that a satellite such as the SMC could have retained such a high gas content if it were accreted over 5 Gyr ago.

In this volume, Burkert discusses the gas consumption timescale for galaxies; upon accretion satellites are cut off from their gas supply and thus their star formation rates should decline over time. However, Gallart (also in this volume) has illustrated that the star formation rates of the LMC have been *increasing*, with no signs of quenching over the past 4 Gyr until very recently.

Taken together these arguments strongly support a scenario where the Clouds are on their first infall to our system, having only been within the virial radius of the MW for the past 1-2 Gyr.

6 Lessons from the Magellanic Clouds

The Magellanic Clouds are recent interlopers in our neighborhood. This statement is a consequence of the dramatically improved proper motions of the MCs made using the HST by K13 and our evolving understanding of the structure of dark matter halos. Specifically, these factors have forced us to reconsider the total dark matter masses of the MCs. The baryon fractions of the MCs and imply that their total masses must be at least a factor of 10 larger than traditionally modeled. Dynamical friction then requires their orbits to be highly eccentric, preventing short period orbits. Finally, the existence of a high relative velocity, LMC-SMC binary today strongly argues against their having completed a previous pericentric approach about our Galaxy, as MW tides can efficiently disrupt such tenuous configurations.

A first infall solution implies that the MCs have interacted as a binary pair prior to accretion; in B10 and B12 we argued that tidal interactions between the pair gave rise to the formation of the Magellanic Stream, Bridge and Leading Arm. As such, interactions between dwarfs galaxies are important drivers of their evolution and may explain the existence of Magellanic Irregular type galaxies (i.e. LMC analogs) in the field.

However, this scenario creates a large challenge for the theory that the satellite galaxies of the MW occupy a unique orbital plane and/or were formed in a common event (see the chapter in this volume by Pavel Kroupa). To be more concise, the biggest challenge posed to this plane of satellites and MOND orbital histories constructed for the MCs is the current gas fraction of the SMC and the consequent requirement that the **SMC must be on a first infall**. Orbits for the SMC in MOND have small periods and apocenters (Zhao et al., 2013). Such orbital solutions cannot explain the absence of quenching in the star formation history of the SMC and the fact that there is currently just as much gas in the SMC as there is in its much larger companion the LMC.

References

Besla G., Kallivayalil N., Hernquist L., Robertson B., Cox T. J., van der Marel R. P.,

Alcock C., 2007, ArXiv Astrophysics e-prints
Besla G., Kallivayalil N., Hernquist L., van der Marel R. P., Cox T. J., Kereš D., 2010, ApJL, 721, L97, [B10]
Besla G., Kallivayalil N., Hernquist L., van der Marel R. P., Cox T. J., Kereš D., 2012, MNRAS, 421, 2109, [B12]
Bland-Hawthorn J., Sutherland R., Agertz O., Moore B., 2007, ApJL, 670, L109
Block D. L., Puerari I., Elmegreen B. G., Bournaud F., 2010, ApJL, 718, L1
Boylan-Kolchin M., Besla G., Hernquist L., 2011, MNRAS, 414, 1560
Boylan-Kolchin M., Bullock J. S., Sohn S. T., Besla G., van der Marel R. P., 2013, ApJ, 768, 140
Diaz J., Bekki K., 2011, MNRAS, 413, 2015
Diaz J. D., Bekki K., 2012, ApJ, 750, 36
Elmegreen B. G., Kim S., Staveley-Smith L., 2001, ApJ, 548, 749
Fakhouri O., Ma C.-P., Boylan-Kolchin M., 2010, MNRAS, 406, 2267
Fox A. J. et al., 2014, ApJ, 787, 147
Gardiner L. T., Noguchi M., 1996, MNRAS, 278, 191
Harris J., Zaritsky D., 2006, AJ, 131, 2514
Kallivayalil N., van der Marel R. P., Alcock C., 2006b, ApJ, 652, 1213
Kallivayalil N., van der Marel R. P., Alcock C., Axelrod T., Cook K. H., Drake A. J., Geha M., 2006a, ApJ, 638, 772
Kallivayalil N., van der Marel R. P., Besla G., Anderson J., Alcock C., 2013, ApJ, 764, 161, [K13]
Liu L., Gerke B. F., Wechsler R. H., Behroozi P. S., Busha M. T., 2011, ApJ, 733, 62
Moster B. P., Naab T., White S. D. M., 2013, MNRAS, 428, 3121
Murai T., Fujimoto M., 1980, PASJ, 32, 581
Nidever D. L., Majewski S. R., Burton W. B., 2008, ApJ, 679, 432
Nidever D. L., Majewski S. R., Butler Burton W., Nigra L., 2010, ApJ, 723, 1618
Piatek S., Pryor C., Olszewski E. W., 2008, AJ, 135, 1024
Růžička A., Theis C., Palouš J., 2010, ApJ, 725, 369
Saha A. et al., 2010, AJ, 140, 1719
Shattow G., Loeb A., 2009, MNRAS, 392, L21
Sohn S. T., Besla G., van der Marel R. P., Boylan-Kolchin M., Majewski S. R., Bullock J. S., 2013, ApJ, 768, 139
van den Bergh S., 2006, AJ, 132, 1571
van der Marel R. P., Fardal M., Besla G., Beaton R. L., Sohn S. T., Anderson J., Brown T., Guhathakurta P., 2012, ApJ, 753, 8
van der Marel R. P., Kallivayalil N., 2014, ApJ, 781, 121
Vieira K. et al., 2010, AJ, 140, 1934
Weiner B. J., Williams T. B., 1996, AJ, 111, 1156
Weisz D. R., Dolphin A. E., Skillman E. D., Holtzman J., Dalcanton J. J., Cole A. A., Neary K., 2013, MNRAS, 431, 364
Zhang X., Lin D. N. C., Burkert A., Oser L., 2012, ApJ, 759, 99
Zhao H., Famaey B., Lüghausen F., Kroupa P., 2013, A&A, 557, L3